DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 248 SO 022 482

AUTHOR Tuttle, William M., Jr.
TITLE America's School-Age Children Fight the War: Political Socialization, Participation, and Patriotism.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the convention of the Organization of American Historians (Chicago, IL, April 4, 1992).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Development; *Childhood Attitudes; Children; Democratic Values; Elementary Secondary Education; Oral History; *Patriotism; *Political Socialization; Social Science Research; United States History; War; *World War II

ABSTRACT

U.S. children who were of school age during World War II underwent a socialization process that led them to have great pride in their country, to believe in the moral certainty of U.S. victory, and to feel united in their participation on the homefront. Excerpts from letters of individuals who were school-aged during the War are used to illustrate this process of political socialization. The excerpts included memories of Franklin Delano Roosevelt both during the War and at the time of his death. Various measures undertaken by educators to promote the values of democracy and other ideals are discussed. Research on the political socialization of children, and the psychological aspects of child development are reviewed. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED349248

"America's School-Age Children Fight the War: Political Socialization, Participation, and Patriotism"

by

William M. Tuttle, Jr.
Professor of History
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William Tuttle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 022 482

Presented at the convention of the Organization of American Historians, Chicago, Illinois, April 4, 1992.

Copyright (c) 1992
Not to be quoted without the written permission of the author.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Above all [else,] as a child I felt invincible," recalled Susan Yarin, who was eight when the war ended. "I felt that nothing would ever happen to me because I was American and on the right side." Anna Gray, who was four years older, agreed, remembering that "Americans rallied together with a fierce pride toward a common goal . . . [which] made me feel very secure and patriotic." America's school-age children were certain not only that their nation's cause was just, but that the United States would prevail. "God was on our side . . . ," explained Beirne Keefer, a boy who was ten years old when the war ended.[1]

This was a war between good and evil; there were no shades of grey, no nuances, especially for America's school-age children. Ranging in age from five or six to puberty, these girls and boys learned well the lesson of their country's righteousness before all nations, imbibing it in their schools and their churches, as well as in the local movie theaters, over the radio, and through participation in homefront activities. Indeed, although feelings of invincibility and moral certainty were two qualities widely shared by the school-age children, another was a sense of personal self-worth, motivated by participation in the war effort. "Our pride in our country," noted a homefront girl from Cleveland, "made us proud of ourselves." Boys and girls collected scrap materials for recycling; they bought war stamps and bonds, knitted afghans, picked milkweed pods, and wrote countless letters to buoy the

spirits of soldiers and sailors abroad. George Curtis, born in 1935, remembered that even helping his parents with their household chores made him feel that he was making "a genuine contribution" and was "a part of the overall team." Whether helping with the dishes or on the farm, George saw the war years "as a time for children such as me to feel of greater human worth or value; to be more respected by adults, because we had the opportunity to . . . contribute."[2]

Nell Thomas's eighth birthday was December 7, 1941, but the day was a bust for her. In fact, no one was interested in her "at all, only this thing at a place called Pearl Harbor." It did not take Nell long to realize that the war would quickly become the all-consuming concern of everyone in her hometown of Greensburg, Pennsylvania. "During this whole period of my life," she remembered, "everything was focused on one thing, winning the war. Every American citizen was part of it, whether they were in the service, or an adult or a child. We were all able to contribute in some way. We were constantly reminded that ours was the best country in the world, and it was our duty to fight to preserve democracy."[3]

Ranging in age from five or six to puberty, the school-age children had a very different homefront experience from the infants, toddlers, and other preschoolers. For the world of the school-age children included not only the school, but popular

culture. It also included patriotism and participation as they collected scrap materials for recycling and saved their dimes to buy War Bonds and stamps.

As the family was the focal point of preschoolers' lives up to the age of five or six, so the school became the focal point for boys and girls older than that. Not coincidentally, as psychologists have discovered, the grade-school years are the years when children become politically socialized. In the elementary schools, political scientist Fred I. Greenstein has observed, "children move from near -- but not complete -- ignorance of adult politics to awareness of most of the conspicuous features of the adult political arena."[4]

These were the years of latency, pictured by Freudian psychology as a time to gain learning and social skills undistracted by sexuality; it was the calm before the storm. Likewise, educators saw it as the period when children learned to become good citizens. Indeed, by legislative fiat, it was in the elementary schools that children learned about the ideals of the "founding fathers" as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. A New Jersey law passed in 1945, for example, mandated that these students be taught "the history of the origin and growth of the social, economic and cultural development of the United States, of American family life, and of the high standard of living and other privileges

enjoyed by the citizens of the United States as will tend to instill into every boy and girl a determination to preserve these principles and ideals. . . ."[5]

Research done on political socialization points to the grade-school years as the formative ones. After testing 12,000 grade-school students, psychologists Robert Hess and David Easton concluded: "Every piece of evidence indicates that the child's political world begins to take shape well before he even enters elementary school and that it undergoes the most rapid change during these years," which were "the truly formative years of the maturing member of a political system. . . ." Psychologists and political scientists have found too that the grade schools were the primary agents of citizenship training and that political attitudes, most of which had been acquired by the end of the eighth grade, remain stable in adolescence.[6]

Certainly none of these social scientists has argued that children develop permanently-fixed political dispositions. Childhood behavioral acquisitions, according to another study, "may only be selectively consequential for adult behavior." Still, as the authors concluded, such acquisitions were not only durable, but "likely to remain as underlying sentiments that can be evoked in later years." One germane study, Children and War: Political Socialization to International Conflict, after surveying the research findings on early learning of concepts

about war, concluded that "war-related attitudes begin to crystallize by age seven, and by fifteen most adolescents express a fairly definite viewpoint about war and peace."[7]

Theories of child development, particularly those articulated by Jean Piaget, illuminate the learning processes engaged in by school-age children.[8] Thus, when considering the overwhelming receptivity of America's school-age children to the wartime messages, it is essential to appreciate not only the messages, but also the children's developing cognitive capacities during the war, such as moral development. In fact, there could not have been a more impressionable time for children to be exposed to the heavy doses of the patriotism and democratic ideology that prevailed on the homefront. And the place to turn to understand the transmission of these messages is not to the home -- the domain of the infants, toddlers, and other preschoolers -- but to the elementary school.[9]

Educators, having long before affirmed this, viewed the Second World War as an important challenge to, and opportunity for, the nation's schools. Soon after the Pearl Harbor attack, a group of prominent women educators set the stage for numerous pronouncements about the roles of the schools in a nation at war. Writing in Education for Victory, this group urged the schools "to guarantee for all children adequate protection, intelligent participation, and balanced perspective." Protection was

obvious, including frequent air raid drills and the provision of gas masks and identification tags. But the two other categories were intensely idealistic -- and propagandistic -- reflecting an ideological certainty about what the United States ought to be -- and, indeed, already was, in the minds of millions of Americans. "Intelligent participation by children includes," the statement read, "understanding patriotism, citizenship, democracy. . . ." And "balanced perspective for children" required:

1. Sensing what America is fighting for by developing an understanding of democratic ideals through daily practice in living them.
2. Seeing that America's fight for democratic principles is but one part of mankind's long struggle for freedom.
3. Knowing the real values that war cannot destroy.
4. Understanding the necessity for personal sacrifices.
5. Understanding and appreciating others by stressing likenesses as opposed to superficial differences among citizens of a democracy.[10]

Not only was it essential for the schools to promote the values of democracy, it also was crucial for them to eradicate hate and other antidemocratic tendencies. "Even a slight trend toward racial prejudice and national hatreds among young children should cause us concern," wrote the chief of elementary education

for New York State's Education Department in 1943. "The very foundation of American society rests on the premise that individuals of different backgrounds can work together for the common good. . . . It is imperative that our young children shall not be encompassed by the weight of our mistakes and prejudices. . . ."[11]

And there was reason to be concerned. Sometimes in their zeal to annihilate the enemy, homefront children generalized their hatred and assaulted and vilified other children at home who were of German, Italian, or Japanese descent. If the espousal of tolerance and democracy distinguished the rhetoric of numerous school-age children, the articulation of prejudice, not to mention the total rejection of certain racial and ethnic groups, was also widespread. Indeed, prejudice and rejection were not only the flip side of tolerance and democracy, they also arrived at about the same time in children's political socialization. As Gordon W. Allport, the psychologist, discovered, children's "totalized rejection" of certain groups began at seven or eight, and "by the age of 12, we may find <u>verbal</u> acceptance, but <u>behavioral</u> rejection. By this age," Allport explained, "the prejudices have finally affected conduct, even while the verbal, democratic norms are beginning to take effect."[12]

Repeatedly, homefront educators expressed the fear that without the democratization of schooling worldwide, there would soon be another generation of fanatics plunging the world into yet another war. One such prognostication was made by an education professor at Northwestern, regarding a boy named Johnny, age seven. Johnny was "an active charming little boy nibbling eagerly of every morsel of life. . . ." But "the only world he knows is a world at war," a world that constantly "emphasized the need of killing other people. He hates Japs and Germans, makes jokes about Mussolini. In his play he murders with tommy-guns. . . ." But in fourteen years, Johnny would be voting. "What kind of world will he want? To grow up in hatred, suspicion, dread and terror is to become a vindictive, suspicious, anxious, terrified adult. Can children thus reared build and maintain the just, orderly and peaceful world for which we profess to fight?" It all depended on the schools: "Unless the school takes vigorous counter measures the results of this war are not worth the fighting. The world will again be run by the emotions of small, selfish, embittered fearful men."[13]

For the great majority of America's school-age children, there was at work a powerful congruence of the democratic message and the educational medium. And as noted earlier, developmentally, these boys and girls were ideal as the receptors of the wartime ideology; cognitively, their mental structures were set to receive. For this reason, America's school-age

children beginning developed moral stances tightly attuned to the United States' lofty war aims. How could it have been otherwise? For example, during the war the NEA distributed 500,000 copies of "The Children's Morality Code," which admonished children to follow "The Laws of Right Living." "The Good American" was all things to all people. The code enumerated these qualities: kind, fair, reliable, cooperative, "does his duty," is loyal to family, school, town, state, country, "and above all things else . . . loyal to humanity."[14]

In terms of wartime political socialization, one figure towered over the homefront: Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Whether glorified or despised by their parents, the President's name was a household word. "Dominating this good old time," observed Willie Morris, the writer, "was the image of FDR -- his voice on the radio, his face with the dark rings under his eyes on the newsreels." To Morris, a homefront boy in Yazoo City, Mississippi, "FDR was the war itself. . . ."[15]

Roosevelt's was the voice which the homefront children heard over the radio, although some of the children admitted that they confused his voice with that of H. V. Kaltenborn, the news commentator. The children knew, though, that whether it was Roosevelt or Kaltenborn on the air, they had to "be quiet." The homefront children recalled that "Roosevelt's talks on the radio"

were "totally reassuring," and that they made him seem "like a 'god' to us kids."[16]

If "you weren't for Roosevelt during the war," remembered James Covert, a homefront boy in Portland, Oregon, "you were not patriotic. He was the man who was going to take us through the war, and anybody who seemed to be against him was sort of un-American." So pro-Roosevelt were some of the school-age children that they defaced the yard signs of the 1944 Republican presidential candidate, Thomas E. Dewey. A boy who lived on Chicago's South Side wrote that such a sign adorned a yard half a block from his school. It had a picture of the candidate on it, and it said, "Vote For Dewey." "Every kid that walked by on the way to school would spit on it."[17]

Not all of the children agreed, of course. After all, Roosevelt was reelected in 1944 with his smallest voter margin yet, drawing just under 55 per cent of the popular vote. "My parents detested FDR," recalled Paul Alexander, a Kansan and the son of a Methodist minister. "They blamed him for all the problems." In other families, there were bitter disputes. One homefront girl described "the arguments my father had with my grandfather over how the war was progressing. My father thought Roosevelt walked on water and my grandfather hated him!" Eleanor Roosevelt also inspired wide-ranging reactions, from adulation to hatred.[18]

Whatever they thought of Roosevelt, most of these homefront children thought that he would, as one explained, "always be there, always be our President." Indeed, for the school-age children, he had always been the President. "He was president when I was born & I was almost 12 when he died," wrote a homefront boy. "When I think of World War II," recalled a girl from Lyons, Kansas, "I always think of the death of The President. He had been President all my life. . . ." "I wondered," wrote a girl from Davenport, Iowa, "if we could win the war without him." And, remembered a girl from Dover, Delaware, "I was shocked the day we learned that President Roosevelt had died. I had assumed that he would be president forever. . . . I was really afraid. I thought nobody else would know how to be president."[19]

Like the flashbulb memories they had of Pearl Harbor earlier and of John F. Kennedy's death years later, for numerous homefront children time stopped when they learned of Roosevelt's death. They remembered the tears and sobbing of their parents and grandparents and the crying of people in the streets. A girl in San Francisco was crying when "a woman walked over, crying as well, and hugged us." An eleven-year-old girl thought her father had gone "into shock -- I never saw him with such an expression on his face. And then he started to cry," something she had never seen him do before. Roosevelt was, another homefront girl

remembered,"the first person I mourned for in my life!" "He was the first person I knew who died," remembered Howard Kleinberg, who was a twelve-year-old in the Bronx, New York. "And it turned out that everyone else knew him. And that brought me into a direct relationship with the rest of the world."[20]

The homefront girls and boys listened to the radio accounts of Roosevelt's funeral train as it proceeded to his home at Hyde Park, New York. Musical dirges accompanied the broadcasters' descriptions. Lining the tracks were grade-school students holding red roses and singing "God Bless America." Howard Kleinberg wrote that at five in the morning, he felt his father shaking him. "Get up," he said, "we're going to say goodbye to the president." They walked to a bridge spanning the Harlem River; under the Bronx side of the bridge ran the railroad tracks toward upstate New York. "There we stood, just the two of us, me and my dad. Through the gloomy dawn, a train light appeared. . . . Slowly it came to a point just under the bridge. . . . I could make out the last car, with its circular windows through which I saw a flag-covered casket. I looked up at my dad. He was saluting -- and he was crying."[21]

Collecting scrap materials, buying War Bonds, observing the rationing requirements, sharing the grief over their President's death, and, most of all, imbibing in the nation's intense pride and unity -- thus did the homefront children participate in the

victory. Such participation was especially important to those children who, beginning at the age of six or seven, had entered a new stage of life. Jean Piaget called it concrete operations; Sigmund Freud called it latency.

"We all . . . became so patriotic," recalled a school-age girl. Aside from families of conscientious objectors, contrary opinions were very rare; in most places, dissent was unheard of and even unimaginable. As a result, the school-age children's recollections echo each other. "We were all so Proud then," wrote a homefront girl from Gary, Indiana; like other children, she knew without a doubt that "we would win." We were "so proud to be Americans," wrote another girl, and that pride "prompted us to do everything we could to hold onto our wonderful way of life." "Through it all," agreed still another girl, "there was this deep sense of pride and togetherness and incredible patriotism." And there was not only national pride, but intense unity. "We had a goal -- victory --," wrote a homefront boy from Duluth, Minnesota, and "we worked towards it."[22]

So intense was the wartime pride and unity that some of the homefront children have insisted that a "bonding" took place among the boys and girls who had lived "in an historic time within a certain age group" and had "shared similar problems in stressful times." "My memories of WW II," wrote a homefront boy who had lived in Lafayette, Indiana, "are of patriotic

excitement, and everyone pulling together to defeat the Japs and Germans." The school-age children shared not only a sense of unity and invincibility, but also of moral and military superiority. "I felt that nothing would happen to me," wrote a homefront girl from Springfield, Massachusetts, "because I was an American and on the right side."[23]

Notes

1. Letters #146, #148, #210, #228, #332, #443.

2. Letters #10, #81. For the larger context in which the politics of patriotic sacrifice and obligation prevailed on the homefront, see Robert B. Westbrook, "'I Want a Girl, Just Like the Girl That Married Harry James': American Women and the Problem of Political Obligation in World War II," American Quarterly, 42 (December 1990), 587-614; Mark H. Leff, "The Politics of Sacrifice on the American Home Front in World War II," Journal of American History, 77 (March 1991), 1296-1318; Leff, "Merchandizing Images of Homefront Sacrifice: Advertising and Propaganda in the United States and Great Britain in World War II" (paper delivered at Indiana University's conference on The American Home Front during World War II, October 1991).

3. Letter #408.

4. Greenstein, Children and Politics (New Haven: Yale University Press, revised edition, 1969), 1.

5. Ibid., 4-5. See also J. Cayce Morrison, "The Teaching of Patriotism," School and Society, 56 (October 3, 1942), 281-86.

6. Ibid., 9-15; Easton and Hess, "The Child's Political World," Midwest Journal of Political Science, 6 (August 1962), 237-38; Richard E. Dawson and Kenneth Prewitt, Political Socialization: An Analytic Study (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969), 44-48; Hess and Judith V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children (Chicago: Aldine, 1967), 220-21; Howard Tolley, Jr., Children and War: Political Socialization to International Conflict (New York: Teachers College Press, 1973), 5-6; Easton and Hess, "Youth and the Political System," in Seymour Lipset and Leo Lowenthal, editors, Culture and Social Character: The Work of David Riesman Reviewed (New York: Free Press, 1961), 226-51; Hess and Easton, "The Child's Changing Image of the President," Public Opinion Quarterly, 24 (Winter 1960), 632-44; Hess and Easton, "The Role of the Elementary School in Political Socialization," School Review, 70 (Autumn 1962), 253-65.

7. Easton and Dennis, Children in the Political System: Origins of Political Legitimacy (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), 107; Tolley, Children and War, 6; Easton and Dennis, "The Child's Acquisition of Regime Norms: Political Efficacy," American Political Science Review, 61 (March 1967), 25-38; Dawson and Prewitt, Political Socialization, 48-50.

8. The problem for the historian who would like to apply Piagetian psychology to the task of explaining the past is that

Piaget focused on internal structures and mental schemata that are unobservable. Because Piaget focused on mental schemata that are unobservable, this is not to say that the functional results of these structures are untestable. Piagetian psychologists have shown the changes in mental structures in a series of fascinating tests in which children, by mentally reversing sequences and reconstructing events, eventually master such concepts as quantity, length, shape, and color, and then "justify" or explain their conclusions and manipulations.

Still, since the goal of the historian is to identify and explain past causal relationships, the challenge is to visualize Piagetian principles for use in assessing the Second World War's impact on the attitudes and values of America's school-age children. According to Piaget, children's learning is a dialectical process, central to which is the quest for equilibrium. At different ages -- for example, 18-24 months, 5-7 years, and 9-11 years -- the child is "vulnerable." Increasingly, his or her understanding of the external world produces negative responses and disconfirmation. The child is in a state of disequilibrium; in Hegelian terms, his or her thesis has begun to inspire an antithesis. And as disconfirmation accumulates, the child pursues and eventually constructs a new equilibrium. With this new world view, the child then proceeds to rewrite his or her history. All of the environmental stimuli coming in take on new meaning. What has happened in that the

child has experienced a vertical change -- a leap upward; but it contains the seeds of its own destruction. Although equilibrium characterizes the child up to 18 months and from the ages of 2 to 4, 7 to 9, and over 11, such equilibrium is dynamic. It constantly requires correcting, just as a car requires steering to keep it on the road. But it is inevitable that the child will go too far and overcorrect, perhaps sending the imaginary car into the ditch. As the disconfirmation accumulates, a new stage begins to set in; there is a quest for a new equilibrium -- and another leap upward.

Piagetian psychology can help historians to appreciate "critical" or "sensitive" periods in children's development, periods in which change seems to come almost regardless of the environment. According to Piaget, up to the age of seven, children's cognitive capabilities are limited in three ways. One limitation is egocentrism, or the inability to assume another's perspective. Another is "centration," or the inability to center on more than one dimension of what she or he perceives. The third is the child's inability to perform an operation requiring reversibility. But at age six or seven, there is the onset of "concrete operations"; and the child begins to overcome these limitations on logicality, thus inaugurating a change which, according to one psychologist, "represents a dramatic transition from illogically based thought to logically based thought." The years between nine and eleven are vulnerable ones for the child.

At about age eleven, the child experiences another quantum leap as she or he develops the ability to generate hypotheses about logical relationships. This is the stage of "formal operations." "Thus," another psychologist has explained, "we now have operations on operations. Thought has become truly logical, abstract, and hypothetical." Neil J. Salkind, Theories of Human Development (New York: Van Nostrand, 1981), 208; Patricia H. Miller, Theories of Developmental Psychology (San Francisco: Freeman, 1983), 62.

Piagetian insights can sensitize historians in other ways as well. The concept of moral development is an outgrowth of Piaget's cognitive psychology, as initially expressed in his seminal work The Moral Judgment of the Child (1932), and as developed by Lawrence Kohlberg and refined by Carol Gilligan. Representative writings of Kohlberg include Stages in the Development of Moral Thought and Action (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969); "Stage and Sequence: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Socialization," in David A. Goslin, editor, Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969), 347-480; "From Is to Ought," in T. Mischel, editor, Cognitive Development and Epistemology (New York: Academic Press, 1971), 151-235; The Philosophy of Moral Development; Volume I, Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice (New York: Harper & Row, 1981). In moral development, Gilligan's most significant publication is In a Different Voice: Psychological

Theory and Women's Development (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982).

Concurrent with the arrival of the stage of concrete operations at about age seven, there is a change in the child's moral sphere. There is a leap from what Piaget called "heteronomy," or blind obedience to authority, to "autonomy," or behavior based on mutual respect. An example is cooperation in game playing, in which children are able to agree on a set of rules and play a game fairly. Still, children in concrete operations tend to be inflexible in their commitment to what they perceive to be "right." At about age eleven, however, with the attainment of formal operational thought, new moral feelings arrive, and, as psychologist Lee C. Lee has written, they "are added to and integrated with the preceding feelings," corresponding "to the newly acquired cognitive structures. Because of the . . . flexibility of thought at this more advanced stage, feelings become decentered. . . . The child can now grasp the concept of humanitarianism, which is the ideological stage of autonomous morality." Lee, Personality Development in Childhood (Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1976), 132-33; James R. Rest, "Morality," in Mussen, Handbook of Child Psychology, Volume III, 566-629.

There is an immense body of literature by and about Piaget. Helpful summaries and bibliographies can be found in John H.

Flavell, The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1963); Jonas Langer, Theories of Development (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969), 87-156; Charles J. Brainerd, Piaget's Theory of Intelligence (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1978); Henry W. Maier, Three Theories of Child Development (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 12-70; Rochel Gelman and Renee Baillargeon, "A Review of Some Piagetian Concepts," in Paul H. Mussen, editor, Handbook of Child Psychology (fourth edition); Volume III, Cognitive Development, John H. Flavell and Ellen M. Markman, editors (New York: Wiley, 1983), 167-230.

One historian has made unique use of Piaget. Thomas Kuhn, the historian of science, has written that a chance encounter with a footnote led him "to the experiments by which Jean Piaget had illuminated both the various worlds of the growing child and the process of transition from one to the next." Referring specifically to Piaget's The Child's Conception of Physical Causality (1930) and Les notions de mouvement of de vitesse chez l'enfant (1946), Kuhn developed a dialectical thesis to explain "the structure of scientific revolutions." The process by which scientific leaps occurred, Kuhn wrote, was very much like the process by which children came to know what they knew. In other words, when a scientific "truth" encountered growing doubts and disconfirmation, alternative explanations were offered, a period of disequilibrium set in, and a transition ensued before a new hypothesis was formulated and a new equilibrium was established.

On the basis of this new world view, scientists then rewrote their understanding of the universe. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, second edition, 1970]), vi.

9. Tolley, Children and War, 11-12; Hess and Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, 92-115.

10. "Educational Policy Concerning Young Children and the War," Education for Victory, 1 (April 15, 1942), 8-9. For federal discussions in this area, see Timothy De Witt Connelly, "Education for Victory: Federal Efforts to Promote War-Related Instructional Activities by Public School Systems, 1940-1945" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1982), 74-117.

11. "The Elementary School and the War," Elementary School Journal, 43 (June 1943), 568; Agnes Benedict, "Towards Democracy," Parents' Magazine, 19 (May 1944), 30-31, 128-29; James Marshall, "Wars Are Made in Classrooms," Saturday Review of Literature, 27 (November 11, 1944), 24; New York Times, January 17, 1943.

12. Letters #302, #370, #373, #408; Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954), 307-10.

13. Howard Lane, "The Good School for the Young Child in Wartime," Education, 63 (February 1943), 352; Jeanie G. Lee, "Every Classroom a Citadel," Journal of the National Education Association, 32 (September 1943), 173-74.

14. The Code of the Good American (Washington: NEA [Personal Growth Leaflet No. 62], n. date), 3-15.

15. Morris, North Toward Home (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967), 37.

16. Letters #50, #114, #171, #246, #394, #442.

17. Covert quoted in Mark Jonathan Harris et al., editors, The Homefront: American During World War II (New York: Putnam's, 1984), 74; letters #62, #376.

18. Letters #4, #30, #50, #154, #387, #456.

19. Letters #74, #220, #248, #254, #284, #328, #408.

20. Letters #46, #50, #74, #129, #178, #209, #210, #220, #321, #324F, #374; Kleinberg, "When Roosevelt Died and a Boy Grew Up," in Lawrence, Kansas, Journal-World, April 12, 1989.

21. Letters #0.2, #50, #64; Kleinberg, "When Roosevelt died and a boy grew up."

22. Letters #10, #32, #50, #53, #64, #87, #114, #146, #148, #166, #248, #257, #440.

23. Letters #228, #236, #240C, #302, #332, #370, #373, #398, #408, #443.